

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/688,574	SEUL, MICHAEL	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Kishor Mayekar	1753	

**All Participants:**

 (1) Kishor Mayekar.

 (2) Eric Mirabel.

**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_\_

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 7 December 2004
**Time:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

**Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:** ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**
**Rejection(s) discussed:**
*the obviousness-type double patenting rejection*
**Claims discussed:**

25

**Prior art documents discussed:**
*prior art of record*
**Part II.**
**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**
*the paper filed 25 October did not include a terminal disclaimer as address in the paper to obviate the obviousness-type double patenting rejection in the first Office action and did not address to the rejection of claim 25.*
**Part III.**

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)